

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 9, 2010. In view of the above amendment and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are requested.

Claims 1-6 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. New claims 25-30 have been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okayama (US 6,249,767) in view of Seligmann (US Pub. 2004/0088107). Claim 1 has been cancelled. This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

New claim 25 recites a portable IC card a storage unit that stores therein an inter-boarding-location timetable indicating a time required for traveling from a nearest boarding location to a transfer location and a calculation unit operable to calculate an expected transfer arrival time of the user at the transfer location by (i) extracting, from the inter-boarding-location timetable, a time required to travel from the nearest boarding location to the transfer location and (ii) adding the expected boarding arrival time at the nearest boarding location to the time extracted from the inter-boarding-location timetable, wherein when the expected transfer arrival time at the transfer location is later than the expected departure time from the transfer location, in place of the reservation, a request is made for a new reservation for another transport that is to depart from the transfer location after the expected transfer arrival time. The combination of Okayama and Seligmann fails to disclose or suggest the above features as recited in claim 1.

Okayama discloses a portable information terminal, including a self-positioning device, to make reservations and obtain status information of available services (see abstract). The terminal of Okayama stores the content of a reservation and collects status information relating to the execution of the reservation content from status information providers, and decides whether reservation content should be changed (i.e., dates or times of reservations) based on collected status information and location information obtained by the self-positioning device (see abstract). The terminal also includes a reservation management table, stored in the terminal, which manages the various reservation chains (see col. 11, lines 10-25).

However, Okayama does not disclose storing a time table that indicates the time required to travel from boarding location to boarding location and using the table to make reservation changes. Therefore, Okayama does not disclose or suggest a portable IC card a storage unit that stores therein an inter-boarding-location timetable indicating a time required for traveling from a nearest boarding location to a transfer location and a calculation unit operable to calculate an expected transfer arrival time of the user at the transfer location by (i) extracting, from the inter-boarding-location timetable, a time required to travel from the nearest boarding location to the transfer location and (ii) adding the expected boarding arrival time at the nearest boarding location to the time extracted from the inter-boarding-location timetable, wherein when the expected transfer arrival time at the transfer location is later than the expected departure time from the transfer location, in place of the reservation, a request is made for a new reservation for another transport that is to depart from the transfer location after the expected transfer arrival time, as recited in claim 25. Seligmann also fails to disclose or suggest the above features of claim 25.

Seligmann discloses providing trip status information periodically to a user in transit to a destination (see abstract). According to Seligmann, the location of the mobile device is received and a time-of-arrival metric is estimated based the device's location, the time, the mode of travel, etc. (see paragraph 14). The computed time-of arrival metrics, as well as the relationship between these metrics and the desired time-of arrival (e.g., early, late, very late, etc.) are then available to the user (see paragraph 28).

However, Seligmann does not disclose storing a time table that indicates the time required to travel from boarding location to boarding location and using the table to make reservation changes. Therefore, Seligmann does not disclose or suggest a portable IC card a storage unit that stores therein an inter-boarding-location timetable indicating a time required for traveling from a nearest boarding location to a transfer location and a calculation unit operable to calculate an expected transfer arrival time of the user at the transfer location by (i) extracting, from the inter-boarding-location timetable, a time required to travel from the nearest boarding location to the transfer location and (ii) adding the expected boarding arrival time at the nearest boarding location to the time extracted from the inter-boarding-location timetable, wherein when the expected transfer arrival time at the transfer location is later than the expected departure time from the transfer location, in place of the reservation, a request is made for a new reservation for

another transport that is to depart from the transfer location after the expected transfer arrival time, as recited in claim 25.

Accordingly, no obvious combination of Okayama and Seligmann would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claim 25. As a result, claim 25 is allowable over the combination of Okayama and Seligmann.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okayama (US 6,249,767) in view of Seligmann (US Pub. 2004/0088107) and further in view of Galperin (US 7,085,726). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

Claim 2 has been cancelled. However, Galperin is distinguished over claims 25-30 below.

Galperin is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing that a minimum connection time MCT also includes a time margin of extra time to account for travel time between gates or delays such as customs and immigration processing. However, it is apparent Galperin fails to disclose or suggest the features lacking from the combination of Okayama and Seligmann discussed above with regard to claim 25. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Okayama, Seligmann, and Galperin would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claim 25. Claims 26-30 are dependent on independent claim 25. Therefore, claims 25-30 are patentable over the combination of Okayama, Seligmann, and Galperin.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okayama (US 6,249,767) in view of Seligmann (US Pub. 2004/0088107) and Galperin (US 7,085,726) and further in view of Kyojima (US 6,950,808). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

Claim 3 has been cancelled. However, Kyojima is distinguished over claims 25-30 below.

Kyojima is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing using a portable IC card. However, it is apparent Kyojima fails to disclose or suggest the features lacking from the combination of Okayama, Seligmann, and Galperin discussed above with regard to claim 25. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Okayama, Seligmann, Galperin, and Kyojima would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claim 25. Claims 26-30

are dependent on independent claim 25. Therefore, claims 25-30 are patentable over the combination of Okayama, Seligmann, Galperin, and Kyojima.

Claims 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okayama (US 6,249,767) in view of Seligmann (US Pub. 2004/0088107) and Galperin (US 7,085,726) and further in view of Izumoto (US Pub. 2002/0004762). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

Claims 4 and 6 have been cancelled. Because the limitations for which Izumoto is relied upon as disclosing are not present in the new claims, this rejection is inapplicable to claims 25-30.

Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okayama (US 6,249,767) in view of Seligmann (US Pub. 2004/0088107), Galperin (US 7,085,726), and Izumoto (US Pub. 2002/0004762) and further in view of Kyojima (US 6,950,808). This rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

Claim 5 has been cancelled. Because the limitations for which Izumoto is relied upon as disclosing are not present in the new claims, this rejection is inapplicable to claims 25-30.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 25-30 are allowable over the references relied upon in the rejection. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 25-30. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 25-30 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Motoji OHMORI et al.

/Allen N. Doyel/

By 2010.05.10 13:23:22 -04'00'

Allen N. Doyel

Registration No. 60,391

Attorney for Applicants

AND/JRF/ats
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 10, 2010